

Final Report
NARST Summer Research Institute (SRI), 2009
University of Missouri

Dates: June 21-26, 2009

Venue: University of Missouri, Columbia

SRI Co-Organizers: Sandra Abell and Pat Friedrichsen, University of Missouri; Carla Zembal-Saul, Penn State University

SRI Anticipated Outcomes:

For Student Researchers:

- To understand the place of their research in the broader research community;
- To build knowledge related to research design, data analysis, and write up;
- To form a network of emerging science education researchers.

For Faculty Mentors:

- To contribute to the induction of emerging researchers into the community of practice;
- To improve science education research through dialogue with a community of researchers.

SRI Invitation Process:

The NARST Board approved the SRI proposal in late fall, 2008. The call for participation as a student researcher or faculty mentor went out on the NARST listservs and was posted to the NARST website in January, 2009. The co-organizers received and reviewed applications during the month of February and invited participants in March. We received 30 applications for student researchers from which we selected 25. (Those not selected either did not fit the teacher learning research theme of the SRI, or were not far enough along in their research.) One of the selected students decided not to attend the SRI because he was moving to his new job. Another student was unable to secure a visa from her country and could not participate. A total of 23 student researchers (from the US, Israel, and Turkey) and 9 faculty mentors (from the US and Brazil) participated in the SRI as listed below.

Doctoral Researcher Participants:

Krista Adams
Arizona State University
kladams@gmail.com

Jason McGraw
Northern Illinois University
jasonmcgraw@yahoo.com

Comfort Ateh
University of California – Davis
cateh@ucdavis.edu

Deborah Morrison
University of Colorado – Boulder
deborah.morrison@colorado.edu

Shirly Avargil
Technion-Israel Institute of Technology
shirly.avargil@gmail.com

Irasema Ortega
Arizona State University
materassi@cox.net

Edith Blackwell
Morgan State University
e.blackwell@ars.esda.gov

Elisabeth Boyer
Pennsylvania State University
eboyer@psu.edu

Dina Drits
University of Utah
dina.drits@utah.edu

Jonah Firestone
Arizona State University
jonah.firestone@asu.edu

Selcen Guzey
University of Minnesota
kendi003@umn.edu

Jessica Hammock
Emory University
jessica.hammock@emory.edu

Hosun Kang
Michigan State University
kanghosu@msu.edu

Michelle Klosterman
University of Florida
klosteml@ufl.edu

Michele Lee
University of Missouri
mhl3h6@mizzou.edu

Faculty Mentors:

Sandra Abell
University of Missouri
abells@missouri.edu

Valarie Akerson
Indiana University
vakerson@indiana.edu

Sinan Ozgelen
Middle East Technical University
sozgelen@metu.edu.tr

Lori Petty
Texas Tech University
loripetty83@gmail.com

Asli Sezen
Pennsylvania State University
azs194@psu.edu

Demetrice Smith
Morgan State University
dsmith@alumni.unc.edu

Sara Tolbert
University of California – Santa Cruz
stolbert@ucsc.edu

Emily Wischow
Purdue University
ewischow@purdue.edu

Steve Witzig
University of Missouri
sbwitzig@mizzou.edu

Sissy Wong
Arizona State University
sissy.wongkavas@asu.edu

Felicia Moore-Mensah
Teachers College – Columbia University
moorefe@tc.columbia.edu

Danusa Munford
Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil
danusa@ufmg.br

Allan Feldman
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
afeldman@educ.umass.edu

Deborah Smith
Pennsylvania State University
dcs27@psu.edu

Patricia Friedrichsen
University of Missouri
friedrichsenp@missouri.edu

Carla Zembal-Saul
Pennsylvania State University
cxz12@psu.edu

Julie Luft
Arizona State University
julie.luft@asu.edu

SRI Schedule:

Faculty mentors met informally during the annual NARST meeting to discuss goals, activities, and schedule. They met again the Sunday afternoon prior to the start of the SRI and again daily during lunch to discuss the schedule, revise plans, reflect on what happened, etc. The SRI began with dinner on Sunday and ended with final group presentations and lunch on Friday. Students were divided into 3 teams of 7-8 students each, mentored by 3 faculty mentors, 2 of whom were more experienced in the field and 1 who was more junior. The greatest amount of time during the SRI was devoted to team time. During this time, students discussed their research and received feedback from the mentors and other team members about research questions, theoretical frameworks, data collection and analysis methods, and helpful resources. Team meetings were structured loosely around the following tasks:

- Day 1: Critical Friends — becoming familiar with each student's research
- Day 2: Continue critical friends / importance of theoretical frameworks
- Day 3: Crafting research questions to align with theoretical frameworks
- Day 4: Aligning theoretical frameworks with research questions, data collection and analysis/Working on NARST proposals
- Day 5: Preparing final skits, NARST proposals

The SRI also included faculty research talks, workshops, and social times. The SRI schedule is included in Appendix A. In addition to these events, the SRI was supported by several virtual mechanisms: a document sharing site; a Twitter stream, and a Flickr site for sharing photos.

SRI Outcomes:

During the SRI, we received continuous unsolicited feedback about the conference. These comments centered on the impact of the SRI on the students as researchers and on improving their research designs. In addition, students commented that they felt the fee was reasonable and they were happy that all costs once they arrived at the SRI were covered. In addition, Troy Sadler, NARST board member, visited the SRI for 1.5 days and collected feedback from the students and faculty mentors.

After the SRI, we constructed a survey and administered it using Survey Monkey. The findings of the survey are presented in Appendix B. Overall the survey results show that participants were very satisfied with their experiences in the NARST SRI.

In addition to these survey results related to the students' reactions to the SRI, another outcome of the conference was the submission of proposals for two NARST sessions:

1. NARST SRI Interactive Poster Session. All but one SRI student (n= 22) submitted proposals regarding their research to the faculty mentors. These proposals were reviewed using the traditional NARST review criteria, and feedback provided to all students. All submissions were selected for the SRI interactive poster session, sponsored by the NARST Research Committee.
2. Sandra Abell and Deborah Smith submitted a proposal for a symposium on mentoring doctoral student researchers on behalf of the faculty mentors, with Justin Dillon of ESERA Summer School as discussant. We await word on the status of this proposal.

SRI Recommendations:

Based on experiences in planning and running the SRI, and on student and faculty mentor feedback, we offer the following recommendations:

1. The SRI offers an important venue for mentoring new researchers into our research community and we recommend that the NARST board continue to support future SRIs. We believe that offering the SRI once every two years is appropriate.
2. We believe that an earlier call for application for students and faculty mentors would generate a greater number of proposals. Below we suggest one possible timeline for SRI host applications and board actions:
 - a. Year 1.
 - i. Announce the call for hosting the SRI at the NARST annual meeting, with applications for hosting due to the Research Committee by fall.
 - ii. The Research Committee makes its recommendation for hosting at the Fall Board meeting, at which time the Board votes.
 - iii. The host institution is informed and begins planning for the SRI, in 2 summers.
 - b. Year 2. During the NARST annual meeting, there is an information session and application materials available for the SRI to take place in Year 3.
 - c. Year 3. Summer SRI held.
3. A team of SRI co-organizers was important—we brought different ideas and skills to the design and implementation process. Having co-organizers from more than one institution was not a hindrance.
4. Commitment from the host institution is necessary. The host institution should contribute the time of the conference organizers as well as a part time graduate student or staff member for assisting with conference logistics. This staffing is critical for success. (The University of Missouri graduate assistant who worked with the SRI was available for trouble shooting throughout the summer institute.)

5. Faculty mentors should be paid for their work. The faculty mentors prepared talks and workshops and reviewed student applications prior to the SRI. During the SRI they were occupied for about 12 hours each day. After the SRI they continued to mentor students and reviewed student applications for the NARST SRI Interactive Poster Session. This level of commitment should be recognized by NARST with a modest honorarium.
6. NARST should explore how to use the NARST website in an interactive manner for the SRI. Our use of several new technologies supported the SRI. Using the NARST website as a one-stop shopping place for SRI participants could be helpful.

SRI Budget:

The NARST Board budgeted \$22,000 for this first SRI, estimated based on participation by 40 students and 8 mentors, and supplemented by additional funding from University of Missouri and from student fees for a total of \$32,600 in income. The table below illustrates budgeted and actual expenses. Because the SRI had fewer student participants than estimated, the University of Missouri contributed \$4000 instead of the estimated \$6000. Because the actual expenditures were less than the total budgeted, we estimate that NARST will be returned \$8602.32 in unspent funds.

Budget
NARST Summer Research Institute, 2009
University of Missouri

Sources	Budgeted Amount (for 40 students and 8 mentors)	Actual Amount (for 23 students and 7 mentors)
1. Income		
• NARST	\$22,000	\$22,000
• University of Missouri	6,000	\$2000 contribution from College of Education \$2000 contribution from Science Education Total: \$4000 contribution (this amount is 1/3 less than estimated based on lower number of students)
• Student fees (\$300 X 40)	12,000	\$6600 (\$300 X 20 plus \$200 X 3 for locals who did not incur hotel expenses)
Total income	\$40,000	\$32,600
2. Expenses		
• Faculty Mentor Travel (\$1000 X 8) (assumes 2 local mentors)	\$8,000	\$4,739.56
• Faculty room (\$120/night X 5 nights X 8 mentors)	4,800	\$2574.00

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student room (shared rooms) (\$60/night X 40 students X 5 nights) 	12,000	\$6074.64
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty meals (\$50/day X 5 days X 10 mentors) (assumes breakfast at the hotel) 	2,500	Mentor/Faculty Lunches \$583.36
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student meals (\$50/day X 5 days X 40 students) (assumes breakfast at the hotel) 	10,000	Student Lunches \$881.25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Break refreshments (for all) 	In above estimates	\$1307.04
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dinners (for all) 	In above estimates	\$4878.44
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials (\$55 X 50) (easel pads, folders, copying, mailing) 	2,700	\$713.74
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GRA 		GRA at .25FTE for 2 months--\$2000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misc. expenses (projector fee, parking, etc.) 		\$245.66
Total expenses	40,000	\$23,997.68
3. Differences		
Income	\$40,000	\$32,000.00
<u>-Expenses</u>	<u>-40,000</u>	- <u>23,997.68</u>
	0	\$ 8,602.32 (returned to NARST)

Respectfully submitted by:

Sandra Abell, Pat Friedrichsen, and Carla Zembal-Saul, Conference Co-organizers

Appendix A

NARST Summer Research Institute, June 21-26, 2009

Schedule

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
6:00-8:30		Breakfast Exercise Writing	Breakfast Exercise Writing	Breakfast Exercise Writing	Breakfast Exercise Writing	Breakfast Exercise Hotel Checkout
8:30-9:00		Whole Group	<i>How to prepare a NARST proposal</i>	Whole Group	Team Session	
9:00-10:30		Team Session	Team Session	Team Session		Team Session
10:30-10:45		BREAK	BREAK	BREAK	BREAK	BREAK
10:45-11:45		Concurrent* Faculty Mentor Research ½	Concurrent* Faculty Mentor Research 3/4	Concurrent* Faculty Mentor Research 5/6	Concurrent* Faculty Mentor Research 7/8	Team Presentations Closing—BOX LUNCH
11:45-1:15	Arrivals & Hotel Registration MENTOR meeting 3-5 321 Townsend Hall	LUNCH Networking Mentor meeting	LUNCH Networking Mentor meeting	LUNCH Networking Mentor meeting	LUNCH Networking Mentor meeting	Departures
1:15-2:45		Workshop 1: Validity in Qualitative Research	Team Session	Workshop 2: Video Analysis	Workshop #3 Finding a Home and Time	
2:45-3:00		BREAK	BREAK	BREAK	BREAK	
3:00-4:00		Team Session	Team Session	Team Session	Team Session (mentor feedback on NARST proposal,	

4:00-5:30					peer review)	
5:30-7:00	Conference Registration Dinner	Dinner Social Time	Dinner Social Time	Dinner Social Time	Dinner Social Time	
7:00-9:00	Opening Session: Panel	Writing Time	OPTIONAL: Intro NVivo Workshop	Writing Time Team Session	OPTIONAL: Intro NVivo Workshop	

*Students select one of 2 faculty talks to attend each session

NARST Summer Research Institute, 2009

Day by Day Schedule

Sunday, June 21st

<u>Time</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Place</u>
6:00 pm – 7:00 pm	Opening Night Dinner	Alumni Center
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm	Opening Session and Panel	Alumni Center

Monday, June 22nd

<u>Time</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Place</u>
6:00 am – 8:00 am	Breakfast/Exercise/Writing	Hampton Inn
<i>Meet at 8:00 am at the front entrance of the Hampton Inn to carpool to Memorial Union</i>		
8:30 am – 9:00 am	Whole Group Meeting	Union N206
9:00 am – 10:30 am	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
10:45 am – 11:45 am	Faculty Research Talk #1 or #2 (See Faculty Talk Schedule)	Union N206 OR Union S207
11:45 am – 1:15 pm	Lunch	Plaza 900
1:15 pm – 2:45 pm	Workshop 1: Validity in Qualitative Research	Union N206
2:45 pm – 3:00 pm	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
3:00 pm – 5:30 pm	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206

		Team 3: Union S302
5:30 pm – 7:30 pm	Dinner: Jack’s Gourmet	Dr. Friedrichsen’s House
7:30 pm – 9:00 pm	Social Time / Writing Time	Hampton Inn

Tuesday, June 23rd

<u>Time</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Place</u>
6:00 am – 8:00 am	Breakfast/Exercise/Writing	Hampton Inn
8:00 am – 8:30 am	Carpool to Memorial Union	Hampton Inn – Front Entrance
8:30 am – 9:00 am	Whole Group Meeting	Union N206
9:00 am – 10:30 am	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
10:45 am – 11:45 am	Faculty Research Talk #3 or #4 (See Faculty Talk Schedule)	Union N206 OR Union S204
11:45 am – 1:15 pm	Lunch	Plaza 900
1:15 pm – 2:45 pm	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
2:45 pm – 3:00 pm	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
3:00 pm – 5:30 pm	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
5:30 pm – 7:00 pm	Dinner	Pasta Factory
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm	Optional NVivo Workshop	Townsend 115

Wednesday, June 24th

<u>Time</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Place</u>
6:00 am – 8:00 am	Breakfast/Exercise/Writing	Hampton Inn
8:00 am – 8:30 am	Carpool to Memorial Union	Hampton Inn – Front Entrance
8:30 am – 9:00 am	Whole Group Meeting	Union N206
9:00 am – 10:30 am	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
10:45 am – 11:45 am	Faculty Research Talk #5 or #6 (See Faculty Talk Schedule)	Union S207 OR Union N206
11:45 am – 1:15 pm	Lunch	Plaza 900
1:15 pm – 2:45 pm	Workshop 2: Video Analysis	Arts & Science Bldg #41
2:45 pm – 3:00 pm	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
3:00 pm – 5:30 pm	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
5:30 pm – 7:30 pm	Dinner	Les Bourgeois, Rocheport
7:30 pm – 9:00 pm	Social Time / Writing Time	Hampton Inn

Thursday, June 25th

<u>Time</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Place</u>
6:00 am – 8:00 am	Breakfast/Exercise/Writing	Hampton Inn
8:00 am – 8:30 am	Carpool to Memorial Union	Hampton Inn – Front Entrance

8:30 am – 10:30 am	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
10:45 am – 11:45 am	Faculty Research Talk #7 or #8 (See Faculty Talk Schedule)	Union N206 OR Union S204
11:45 am – 1:15 pm	Lunch	Plaza 900
1:15 pm – 2:45 pm	Workshop 3: Finding a Home and Time	Union N206
2:45 pm – 3:00 pm	Break – Coffee and Refreshments	Union N206
3:00 pm – 5:30 pm	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S206 Team 3: Union S302
5:30 pm – 7:00 pm	Dinner	Upper Crust
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm	Optional NVivo Workshop	Townsend 115
	Social Time / Writing Time	Hampton Inn

Friday, June 26th

<u>Time</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Place</u>
6:00 am – 8:30 am	Breakfast/Exercise/Hotel Checkout	Hampton Inn
8:30 am – 9:00 am	Carpool to Memorial Union	Hampton Inn – Front Entrance
9:00 am – 10:30 am	Team Session	Team 1: Union N232 Team 2: Union S204 Team 3: Union S302
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Break	

10:45 am – 11:45 am	Team Presentations	Union S107
11:45 am – 12:00 pm	Boxed Lunches and Closing	Union S107
12:00 pm – 5:00 pm	Departures	

NARST Summer Research Institute, 2009

Faculty Talk Schedule

10:45 am – 11:45 am, Monday through Thursday

Monday, June 22nd

<p>Faculty Talk #1: Union N206</p> <p>Sandra Abell and Pat Friedrichsen: Using the PCK construct to study secondary science teacher learning</p>	<p>Faculty Talk #2: Union S207</p> <p>Carla Zemba-Saul: Investigating Learning to Teach Elementary School Science as Argument</p>																								
<p>Attendees</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Adams, Krista</td><td>McGraw, Jason</td></tr> <tr><td>Ateh, Comfort</td><td>Morrison, Deborah</td></tr> <tr><td>Avargil, Shirly</td><td>Munford, Danusa</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackwell, Edith</td><td>Ortega, Irasema</td></tr> <tr><td>Boyer, Elisabeth</td><td>Ozgelen, Sinan</td></tr> <tr><td>Drits, Dina</td><td>Sezen, Asli</td></tr> <tr><td>Feldman, Allan</td><td>Smith, Demetrice</td></tr> <tr><td>Firestone, Jonah</td><td>Tang, Nai-En</td></tr> <tr><td>Guzey, Selcen</td><td>Tolbert, Sara</td></tr> <tr><td>Halverson, Kristy</td><td>Wischow, Emily</td></tr> <tr><td>Klosterman, Michelle</td><td>Witzig, Steve</td></tr> <tr><td>Luft, Julie</td><td>Wong, Sissy</td></tr> </table>	Adams, Krista	McGraw, Jason	Ateh, Comfort	Morrison, Deborah	Avargil, Shirly	Munford, Danusa	Blackwell, Edith	Ortega, Irasema	Boyer, Elisabeth	Ozgelen, Sinan	Drits, Dina	Sezen, Asli	Feldman, Allan	Smith, Demetrice	Firestone, Jonah	Tang, Nai-En	Guzey, Selcen	Tolbert, Sara	Halverson, Kristy	Wischow, Emily	Klosterman, Michelle	Witzig, Steve	Luft, Julie	Wong, Sissy	<p>Attendees</p> <p>Akerson, Valarie Hammock, Jessica Hibbert, Lianne Kang, Hosun Lee, Michele Moore-Mensah, Felicia Ozdem, Yasemin Petty, Lori Schaffer, Dannah Sickel, Aaron</p>
Adams, Krista	McGraw, Jason																								
Ateh, Comfort	Morrison, Deborah																								
Avargil, Shirly	Munford, Danusa																								
Blackwell, Edith	Ortega, Irasema																								
Boyer, Elisabeth	Ozgelen, Sinan																								
Drits, Dina	Sezen, Asli																								
Feldman, Allan	Smith, Demetrice																								
Firestone, Jonah	Tang, Nai-En																								
Guzey, Selcen	Tolbert, Sara																								
Halverson, Kristy	Wischow, Emily																								
Klosterman, Michelle	Witzig, Steve																								
Luft, Julie	Wong, Sissy																								

Tuesday, June 23rd

<p>Faculty Talk #3: Union N206</p> <p>Felicia Moore-Mensah: Diversity: Self, Teaching, & Research in Science Education</p>	<p>Faculty Talk #4: Union S204</p> <p>Valarie Akerson: Supporting Preservice Elementary Teachers' Nature of Science Instruction Through a Community of Learners</p>																								
<p>Attendees</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Ateh, Comfort</td><td>Munford, Danusa</td></tr> <tr><td>Avargil, Shirly</td><td>Ortega, Irasema</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackwell, Edith</td><td>Sezen, Asli</td></tr> <tr><td>Feldman, Allan</td><td>Siegel, Marcelle</td></tr> <tr><td>Hammock, Jessica</td><td>Smith, Deborah</td></tr> <tr><td>Hibbert, Lianne</td><td>Smith, Demetrice</td></tr> <tr><td>Kang, Hosun</td><td>Tolbert, Sara</td></tr> <tr><td>Klosterman, Michelle</td><td>Wischow, Emily</td></tr> <tr><td>Lee, Michele</td><td>Wong, Sissy</td></tr> <tr><td>Luft, Julie</td><td>Zemba-Saul, Carla</td></tr> <tr><td>McGraw, Jason</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Morrison, Deborah</td><td></td></tr> </table>	Ateh, Comfort	Munford, Danusa	Avargil, Shirly	Ortega, Irasema	Blackwell, Edith	Sezen, Asli	Feldman, Allan	Siegel, Marcelle	Hammock, Jessica	Smith, Deborah	Hibbert, Lianne	Smith, Demetrice	Kang, Hosun	Tolbert, Sara	Klosterman, Michelle	Wischow, Emily	Lee, Michele	Wong, Sissy	Luft, Julie	Zemba-Saul, Carla	McGraw, Jason		Morrison, Deborah		<p>Attendees</p> <p>Adams, Krista Boyer, Elisabeth Drits, Dina Firestone, Jonah Guzey, Selcen Ozdem, Yasemin Ozgelen, Sinan Petty, Lori Schaffer, Dannah Sickel, Aaron Witzig, Steve</p>
Ateh, Comfort	Munford, Danusa																								
Avargil, Shirly	Ortega, Irasema																								
Blackwell, Edith	Sezen, Asli																								
Feldman, Allan	Siegel, Marcelle																								
Hammock, Jessica	Smith, Deborah																								
Hibbert, Lianne	Smith, Demetrice																								
Kang, Hosun	Tolbert, Sara																								
Klosterman, Michelle	Wischow, Emily																								
Lee, Michele	Wong, Sissy																								
Luft, Julie	Zemba-Saul, Carla																								
McGraw, Jason																									
Morrison, Deborah																									

Wednesday, June 24th



Faculty Talk #5: Union S207 Deborah Smith: Teacher knowledge, discourses, and practices in supporting young children’s beginnings in school science	Faculty Talk #6: Union N206 Julie Luft: A mixed methods study of secondary science teachers in their first three years
Attendees Adams, Krista Akerson, Valarie Ateh, Comfort Feldman, Allan Firestone, Jonah Guzey, Selcen Hammock, Jessica Klosterman, Michelle Lee, Michele Munford, Danusa Ortega, Irasema Ozdem, Yasemin Wong, Sissy	Attendees Avargil, Shirly Blackwell, Edith Boyer, Elisabeth Drits, Dina Kang, Hosun McGraw, Jason Moore-Mensah, Felicia Morrison, Deborah Ozgelen, Sinan Petty, Lori Sezen, Asli Schaffer, Dannah Sickel, Aaron Siegel, Marcelle Smith, Demetrice Tolbert, Sara Wischow, Emily Witzig, Steve Zembal-Saul, Carla

Thursday, June 25th





Faculty Talk #7: Union N206 Allan Feldman: Using Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) to Understand Inservice Science Teacher Learning	Faculty Talk #8: Union S204 Danusa Munford: Studying classrooms of prospective teachers’ courses to characterize practices involved in learning to teach science at the university
Attendees Akerson, Valarie Ateh, Comfort Boyer, Elisabeth Drits, Dina Firestone, Jonah Hammock, Jessica Klosterman, Michelle Lee, Michele Luft, Julie McGraw, Jason Moore-Mensah, Felicia Morrison, Deborah Ortega, Irasema Sezen, Asli Siegel, Marcelle Smith, Deborah Wischow, Emily Wong, Sissy	Attendees Adams, Krista Avargil, Shirly Blackwell, Edith Guzey, Selcen Halverson, Kristy Kang, Hosun Ozdem, Yasemin Ozgelen, Sinan Petty, Lori Sickel, Aaron Smith, Deborah Tolbert, Sara Witzig, Steve Zembal-Saul, Carla

Appendix B

Evaluation Survey Results (n=21)

1. In which phase of your dissertation work were you at the beginning of the institute?			
	<i>answered question</i>		21
	<i>skipped question</i>		0
		Response Percent	Response Count
Just getting started -- I did not have refined research questions.		9.5%	2
Near the beginning -- I had research questions, some ideas about a theoretical framework, and some unformed ideas about my study design.		47.6%	10
Proposal phase -- I had a solid dissertation proposal that was supported by my committee, but had not started data collection.		14.3%	3
Data collection -- I had collected my dissertation data, but was not very far along in terms of analysis.		9.5%	2
Data analysis -- I had collected my data and was in the process of analysis.		9.5%	2
Writing it up -- My dissertation research was largely completed and I was writing up the final document.		9.5%	2
 Hide replies Other (please specify)			1
1. Although I was in the process of collecting my data and starting a little analyzing during the SRI I changed a lot and thought about my research questions and the theoretical framework		Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM	 Find...





2. With which team did you participate?			
	<i>answered question</i>		21
	<i>skipped question</i>		0
		Response Percent	Response Count
Team 1		33.3%	7
Team 2		33.3%	7
Team 3		33.3%	7

3. Select the response that corresponds to your assessment of the quality of the following aspects of the NARST Summer Research Institute.					
	<i>answered question</i>				21
	<i>skipped question</i>				0
	Outstanding	Good	Mediocre	Needs significant improvement	Response Count
Faculty research presentations	57.1% (12)	42.9% (9)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Team sessions	81.0% (17)	19.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Workshops	52.4% (11)	47.6% (10)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Closing ceremony	85.7% (18)	9.5% (2)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21
Faculty mentoring	100.0% (21)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
 Hide replies Explain your ratings for any SRI aspects that you rated below "Good."					7
1.	Team sessions were very useful especially working in smaller groups; they gave the opportunity to really discuss your own research. In the critical friend session at the end I think that there was a need for each participant to present in a few minutes his/her research again after the modifications. It was a little hard to follow all 8 researches.			Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM	 Find...
2.	A workshop did not start the time.			Tue, Jul 21, 2009 3:31 AM	 Find...
3.	I chose "good" for faculty research presentations because some were much more engaging and informative than others. For a particular presentation, it was unsettling to have the presenter use a student's work as a method to explain the model, and when this professor could not answer a majority of the questions from the audience, the student whose work was being used as the example had to take over and explain as much as			Wed, Jul 15, 2009 2:35 PM	 Find...

3. Select the response that corresponds to your assessment of the quality of the following aspects of the NARST Summer Research Institute.

possible.

Also, I would have liked the opportunity to see all of the presentations. It was difficult to choose one over the other at times when I was interested in both topics.

- | | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|---|
| 4. | I think most of the presentations by faculty were outstanding. It would have been nice to work with our own data during the INVIVO workshop. The mentors were phenomenal and the closing ceremony was wonderful :-) | Tue, Jul 14, 2009 3:09 PM |  Find... |
| 5. | After listening NARST presentations in April, presentation were not very different from the research at NARST conference. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 7:39 PM |  Find... |
| 6. | I already knew a lot of what was taught in the workshops. I would have benefited from more advanced research methodology like discussions of coding and design decisions. Would have liked a more interactive approach to the faculty talks like "This is where I started this was my thought process" Rather than I presentation which could have taken place at a conference. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM |  Find... |
| 7. | The workshops and mentoring stand out beyond the rest so that is why they are outstanding. Really, all aspects exceeded my expectations. While some topics did not fit my interest (ie, some faculty research) it all expanded my awareness of the field and was worth my time. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM |  Find... |




4. Select the response that best corresponds to your opinions about the timing and duration of the following aspects of the NARST Summer Research Institute.

	<i>answered question</i>			21
	<i>skipped question</i>			0
	We spent too much time doing this.	We spent the right amount of time doing this.	We spent too little time doing this.	Response Count
Faculty research presentations	4.8% (1)	95.2% (20)	0.0% (0)	21
Team sessions	4.8% (1)	81.0% (17)	14.3% (3)	21




4. Select the response that best corresponds to your opinions about the timing and duration of the following aspects of the NARST Summer Research Institute.






Workshops	19.0% (4)	66.7% (14)	14.3% (3)	21
Unstructured time	0.0% (0)	71.4% (15)	28.6% (6)	21
Writing time	4.8% (1)	52.4% (11)	42.9% (9)	21
Meeting with faculty mentors from our team	4.8% (1)	85.7% (18)	9.5% (2)	21
Meeting with faculty mentors from teams other than our own	0.0% (0)	47.6% (10)	52.4% (11)	21
Working on NARST proposals	19.0% (4)	57.1% (12)	23.8% (5)	21
 Hide replies Share any comments that will help us better understand your responses to this question.				11

25 responses per page 

1. There were several mentors who I would have loved to get to know a little bit better. It was great that we had opportunities to sign up for short conferences with some mentors. Perhaps these could be supplemented with more informal time with mentors from other teams (at lunch/dinner?) Fri, Jul 24, 2009 1:11 PM  [Find...](#)
2. I think that in the SRI you get a lot of information and think a lot about the research. Personally I felt that I had needed to go back home and write quietly. I did not feel that I could write while in the SRI. When I got back home and read again all the comments and suggestion than it came to me. Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM  [Find...](#)
3. Team sessions/writing time = I feel that no matter how much time we spent, I felt like we needed even more. Mon, Jul 20, 2009 6:04 PM  [Find...](#)

4. Select the response that best corresponds to your opinions about the timing and duration of the following aspects of the NARST Summer Research Institute.








- | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|---|
| 4. | The research program was intense. There was so much information, but we needed it all. There are some things I can not use at this stage, but I will have my notes and my mentors as I proceed through the dissertation process. I truly believe that all the students came away with valuable information, regardless of where you were in the dissertation process. Information was straightforward and questions answered directly and succinctly. The dissertation and research process was de-mystified! | Sun, Jul 19, 2009 10:22 PM |  Find... |
| 5. | More time should be allotted for meeting with other mentors out of ones team. There was not enough time for this. | Wed, Jul 15, 2009 4:26 PM |  Find... |
| 6. | I felt like there was too much information for us to absorb during the week. I did not want to spend time working on NARST proposals then and prefer to do it at home. | Wed, Jul 15, 2009 12:02 AM |  Find... |
| 7. | The teams were wonderful, and I think a good attempt at allowing for time to speak with other mentors was provided on Thursday. Informal occasions were another opportunity. If there is any way to more deliberate about time with other mentors, that would be ideal.

I, personally, really needed to write. | Tue, Jul 14, 2009 1:51 PM |  Find... |
| 8. | The proposals should have been a take home piece which would continue team contact after the workshop - my team decided to do this but it was a stressor during the week before we came to this decision. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM |  Find... |
| 9. | I don't know how to schedule this time any better - I would have like writing time or time to read a key article to learn more about what someone suggested to me; however, I also wouldn't want to cut any events, especially open time with other grad students and mentors. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM |  Find... |
| 10. | Needed more time to hash out my dissertation prospectus before jumping into writing the proposal. In our team, we were asked to work on the proposal alone for the last day and a half--too much time to dedicate to a project for which I wasn't quite ready. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:41 PM |  Find... |
| 11. | I thought the structure was a nice balance- I enjoyed the workshops but I found myself wanting more team time. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:25 PM |  Find... |

5. The statements below identify possible outcomes of the Summer Research Institute (SRI). Indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement.						
	<i>answered question</i>					21
	<i>skipped question</i>					0
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable	Response Count
The SRI allowed me to create a new network of science education colleagues.	90.5% (19)	9.5% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
The SRI allowed me to network with peers.	95.2% (20)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
The SRI allowed me to network with established science education researchers.	85.7% (18)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
The SRI helped me establish/refine a theoretical framework for my study.	47.6% (10)	52.4% (11)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
The SRI helped me create/refine research questions for my study.	57.1% (12)	42.9% (9)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21






5. The statements below identify possible outcomes of the Summer Research Institute (SRI). Indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement.						
The SRI helped me develop/refine a plan for collecting data.	14.3% (3)	61.9% (13)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	9.5% (2)	21
The SRI help me develop/refine an analysis plan for my study.	15.0% (3)	55.0% (11)	20.0% (4)	5.0% (1)	5.0% (1)	20
The SRI helped me align my theoretical framework and research questions.	52.4% (11)	47.6% (10)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
The SRI helped me align my research questions and methods.	40.0% (8)	60.0% (12)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	20
The SRI helped me align my theoretical framework and methods.	38.1% (8)	57.1% (12)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
The SRI has changed the way I will conduct my dissertation research.	28.6% (6)	23.8% (5)	33.3% (7)	4.8% (1)	9.5% (2)	21
The SRI has changed the way I think	57.1% (12)	28.6% (6)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21

5. The statements below identify possible outcomes of the Summer Research Institute (SRI). Indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement.



about myself as a researcher.							
The SRI helped me develop confidence as a researcher.	57.1% (12)	38.1% (8)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.8% (1)	21	
 Hide replies Share any comments that will help us better understand your responses to this question.						6	
1.	It was a very important experience!					Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM	 Find...
2.	This was the most difficult part of the dissertation to understand and refine. However, I feel that I understand how it all fits together.					Sun, Jul 19, 2009 10:22 PM	 Find...
3.	The theme on theoretical framework was powerful for me especially as the mentors in my team were all versed on it helped me understand ways to conceive it in my study.					Wed, Jul 15, 2009 4:26 PM	 Find...
4.	SRI was highly beneficial to me. I feel that this experience has changed me as a scholar and research in terms of how I approach and think about academia in general.					Wed, Jul 15, 2009 2:35 PM	 Find...
5.	Limited time was spent on considering analysis - primarily we focused on theoretical framework, research questions, and data collection.					Tue, Jul 14, 2009 1:51 PM	 Find...
6.	I grew in leaps EVERYDAY. On the way home, I felt my research project, which had been a jumble for months, open up in my mind and all the pieces fit appropriately in interesting places. These were the most important 5 days that I've spent in all of grad school.					Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM	 Find...

6. The items below indicate possible learning outcomes of the Summer Research Institute. Indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. Because of my participation in SRI, I learned about...					
	<i>answered question</i>				21
	<i>skipped question</i>				0
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
... tools for supporting/organizing my research life and social networking tools.	47.6% (10)	47.6% (10)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21
... theoretical frameworks.	52.4% (11)	42.9% (9)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21
... publishing education research.	42.9% (9)	52.4% (11)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21
... issues relevant to science teacher education.	47.6% (10)	52.4% (11)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
... how to write a NARST proposal.	33.3% (7)	52.4% (11)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	21
... how to establish a research agenda.	9.5% (2)	76.2% (16)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	21
... how to mentor.	28.6% (6)	61.9% (13)	9.5% (2)	0.0% (0)	21
... what it means to be a faculty member.	28.6% (6)	66.7% (14)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21
... skills necessary for science education	42.9% (9)	52.4% (11)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21


6. The items below indicate possible learning outcomes of the Summer Research Institute. Indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. Because of my participation in SRI, I learned about...					
research.					
... how to frame research questions.	66.7% (14)	33.3% (7)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21

7. Select the response that corresponds to your assessment of the quality of the following aspects of the NARST Summer Research Institute.					
	<i>answered question</i>				21
	<i>skipped question</i>				0
	Outstanding	Good	Mediocre	Needs significant improvement	Response Count
Hotel accommodations	85.0% (17)	15.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	20
Facilities for group sessions and presentations	61.9% (13)	38.1% (8)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Technology/internet access	23.8% (5)	61.9% (13)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	21
Lunch sessions	47.6% (10)	52.4% (11)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Group dinners	76.2% (16)	23.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
 Hide replies Other (please specify)					6
1.	Maybe more fruit for breaks. The cookies and donuts only made you sleepy after lunch.			Sun, Jul 19, 2009 10:22 PM	 Find...
2.	Technology was an issue, but thanks to Aaron everything was fixed!			Wed, Jul 15, 2009 2:35 PM	 Find...
3.	The faculty mentors treated us extremely well throughout the week. I felt spoiled--we had lovely accommodations, nice daytime facilities and beautiful dinners and other social experiences.			Wed, Jul 15, 2009 12:02 AM	 Find...
4.	Availability of faculty members was outstanding.			Mon, Jul 13, 2009 7:39 PM	 Find...






7. Select the response that corresponds to your assessment of the quality of the following aspects of the NARST Summer Research Institute.

- | | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|---|
| 5. | Would have liked a hotel with a social space such as a bar or even a cafe to socialize during the evenings. | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM |  Find... |
| 6. | Dinners stand out as the best; "good" is still very good; tech issue: I would've liked to access Missouri's library's article database while on campus (my home univ. VPN didn't work.) | Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM |  Find... |












8. Which aspects of the SRI were most useful for you?

<i>answered question</i>		21
<i>skipped question</i>		0
		Response Count
 Hide replies		21






25 responses per page 











- | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------|---|
| 1. | The Team sessions where we discussed each others proposals/research questions was extremely helpful! Getting feedback on my research from faculty members that were not on my dissertation committee was great, and extremely helpful! | Fri, Jul 24, 2009 2:19 PM |  Find... |
| 2. | Networking! The SRI allowed me to meet and begin building relationships with some fantastic mentors and colleagues. The institute also served as a formal introduction to NARST and allowed me to begin working toward becoming more involved in conferences, reviewing, and leadership. | Fri, Jul 24, 2009 1:11 PM |  Find... |
| 3. | mentoring and networking | Wed, Jul 22, 2009 8:36 AM |  Find... |
| 4. | Meeting with faculty from other schools, discussions with other graduate students, and working with my dissertation framework. | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 2:57 PM |  Find... |
| 5. | Team sessions | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM |  Find... |











8. Which aspects of the SRI were most useful for you?

6.	Before the SRI I started to write the discussion part for my dissertation, thus some comments from mentors about discussion were very important for me. Also, during the meetings with faculty mentors I realized that I need a new part for my theoretical framework.	Tue, Jul 21, 2009 3:31 AM	 Find...
7.	The with current faculty and science researchers, but also networking with individuals in my same or similar PhD stages. It was also very beneficial to hear and see that many of the attendees have the same issues and concerns that I have.	Mon, Jul 20, 2009 6:04 PM	 Find...
8.	Networking and listening to the ideas of other researchers; working in small groups	Mon, Jul 20, 2009 2:19 PM	 Find...
9.	one on one with faculty mentors, more specifically to meet with three faculty members.	Sun, Jul 19, 2009 10:22 PM	 Find...
10.	Faculty presentations and mentoring sessions.	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 4:26 PM	 Find...
11.	Development of theoretical frameworks, time to talk to science education professionals, meeting other students, time to collaborate, and the 5-5-5 strategy of explaining our work and receiving feedback. This experience was life changing in the most positive way possible. I am very grateful for being chosen to attend the SRI!	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 2:35 PM	 Find...
12.	Refining my research questions. I felt supported and encouraged by our researcher mentors and other graduate students, which I do not usually feel in my home university because everybody is always too busy to take time to really discuss my work. I like how our working group decided on our agenda rather than having it totally predetermined, this allowed all of us to meet our needs. I learned about theoretical frameworks that researchers and graduate students in other universities are using. I learned about research areas that are currently "hot," and how researchers who are top in the field are approaching this research. I was exposed to Nvivo, which I may not otherwise have been, and to new research tools for gathering information.	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 12:02 AM	 Find...
13.	The interaction with the group mentors and the opportunity to network with faculty and graduate students.	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 3:09 PM	 Find...
14.	The time with mentors and the networking opportunity.	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 1:51 PM	 Find...
15.	Creating the community with future researchers and learning about upcoming research.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 7:39 PM	 Find...
16.	Time to talk with my team. Critical friends, listening to our mentors discuss their and our research. Learning how to listen.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM	 Find...


8. Which aspects of the SRI were most useful for you?


	(no order intended)		
17.	a. working with grad students (peers), learning about their grad school experience and research, and talking about their personal issues with their projects b. exposure to the field of science ed (I am in a ed tech program - our theoretical cannon is different) c. key advice from smart faculty about my project (current project and dissertation ideas) d. discussion of qualitative research (faculty presentation and through mentoring)	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM	 Find...
18.	Team sessions--loved the fact that the student:faculty ratio allowed for sufficient one on one time with mentors. Was great to have the opportunity to work on my own research project, and to get feedback from so many different professors and colleagues.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:41 PM	 Find...
19.	15 discussion about own research during the team session (critical friends group with mentors)	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:37 PM	 Find...
20.	working with mentors	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:34 PM	 Find...
21.	The opportunity to network with other people in the science education community- this was absolutely invaluable. It was great to get feedback from those outside of my institution.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:25 PM	 Find...









9. Which aspects of the SRI were least useful for you?		
	<i>answered question</i>	19
	<i>skipped question</i>	2
		Response Count
	 Hide replies	19
<input type="text" value="25 responses per page"/>		
1.	I think the workshops could have been shortened a bit to allow for group interaction time.	Fri, Jul 24, 2009 2:19 PM  Find...
2.	I can't think of any aspect of the SRI Institute that was not useful. Time spent working on final presentations at the end may have been better spent networking or working on our writing and proposals.	Fri, Jul 24, 2009 1:11 PM  Find...
3.	closing ceremonies	Wed, Jul 22, 2009 8:36 AM  Find...
4.	Some of the faculty presentations were a bit beyond what I need right now.	Tue, Jul 21, 2009 2:57 PM  Find...
5.	Writing the narst proposal	Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM  Find...
6.	Because of my time problem, I did not join some workshops.	Tue, Jul 21, 2009 3:31 AM  Find...
7.	Listening to everyone in a large group more than once	Mon, Jul 20, 2009 2:19 PM  Find...
8.	I enjoyed every second at the SRI and wished some aspects had more time than others. Although the dinner time provided time to socialize, which I did enjoy, unfortunately if I have to rank the importance of the different aspects, it would be at the bottom of my list.	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 4:26 PM  Find...
9.	Nothing. The only thing I did not find useful was the presentation where the presenter was not able to answer questions on the topic that was being discussed.	Wed, Jul 15, 2009  Find...

9. Which aspects of the SRI were least useful for you?		
		2:35 PM
10.	Writing the NARST proposal	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 12:02 AM  Find...
11.	Some of the workshops.	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 3:09 PM  Find...
12.	N/A	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 1:51 PM  Find...
13.	faculty presentations.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 7:39 PM  Find...
14.	The workshops. I knew most of what was taught and could have benefited from writing time or additional team meetings.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM  Find...
15.	no answer - every event had some importance on its own or to add to another event scheduling of research was great because there was always something interesting to hear; for example, I am not interested in elementary ed and there were never two ed sessions at once	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM  Find...
16.	NARST proposal tutorials and writing time--most of us have presented at NARST and have received extensive mentoring at our home institutions. Would have liked to focus more on what we had started at the beginning of the week (i.e. working on refining our own research projects, etc.).	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:41 PM  Find...
17.	All aspects were greatly useful to me.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:37 PM  Find...
18.	group presentation	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:34 PM  Find...
19.	Although I found all aspects useful, probably the workshops were least useful (with the exception of the publishing workshop, which was incredibly useful). I enjoyed them, but I would have liked more team time. One possibility would be to run workshops the same way as faculty research presentations, offer them at fewer times and let participants choose which ones to attend.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:25 PM  Find...












10. What recommendations do you have for improving future SRI?

	<i>answered question</i>	20
	<i>skipped question</i>	1
		Response Count
	 Hide replies	20


25 responses per page 

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Everything was great! My only recommendation would be that the SRI continues next year! More students should have the opportunity to be a part of this! | Fri, Jul
24, 2009
2:19 PM | 
Find... |
| 2. | My recommendations have more to do with what happens after SRI ... Obviously a lot of the relationships we began at SRI will continue to develop organically as we spend more time in the field; however, having had such a fantastic week, I think it would have been reassuring to leave with some expectations for how SRI participants and mentors may be able to stay in touch. Perhaps we could have some sort of WIKI where participants update their progress? | Fri, Jul
24, 2009
1:11 PM | 
Find... |
| 3. | not much it was frankly fantastic! | Wed, Jul
22, 2009
8:36 AM | 
Find... |
| 4. | More time on my own to mull over issues. Also, better access to research materials. | Tue, Jul
21, 2009
2:57 PM | 
Find... |
| 5. | Just what I have said above | Tue, Jul
21, 2009
4:19 AM | 
Find... |
| 6. | I think according to participant' research topic, some other researchers will be invited. | Tue, Jul
21, 2009
3:31 AM | 
Find... |
| 7. | Implement more writing time. Writing time after dinner and before breakfast can be very exhausting. | Mon, Jul
20, 2009
2:19 PM | 
Find... |
| 8. | Simply ensure the research institute continues to train researchers. The lessons learned were invaluable. | Sun, Jul
19, 2009
10:22 PM | 
Find... |










10. What recommendations do you have for improving future SRI?

9.	<p>Allow more time for participants to interact with peers about their research and allowing more time for individual writing and sharing.</p> <p>Participants should write daily. However, the way the program was planned with writing at the end of the day, this could not be achieved considering one was tired from an exhaustive day. Writing in the morning was also a bit challenging as they day started pretty early.</p>	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 4:26 PM	 Find...
10.	<p>More down time to write and meet with mentors within our teams and outside. The 12 hour days were long, but I got a lot from it! Also, there were about 9 mentors, and I could only meet with 3 outside of my team to discuss my current research. I wanted to talk to more, but ran out of time. I do appreciate the flexibility in the schedule to allow us to schedule time to talk with mentors outside of our team. This, I believe, was a modification to the schedule, and it was great!</p>	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 2:35 PM	 Find...
11.	<p>It was pretty much perfect--I really don't even know.</p>	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 12:02 AM	 Find...
12.	<p>I believe I could have used more time to work on my own writing. For many of us writing a NARST proposal was not a new thing. I could have used the feedback on other papers I was working on at the time. Many of us are at different stages in our dissertation . It would have been useful to receive some feedback regarding the lit review, methods, etc.</p>	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 3:09 PM	 Find...
13.	<p>Divide groups both by general topics as well as how far along individuals are in their research so each student can move forward during the week.</p>	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 1:51 PM	 Find...
14.	<p>Working on the NARST proposals should be more flexible. we may not aim to finish it because many of has made big changes on their research and did not have enough literature to finish the proposal completely.</p>	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 7:39 PM	 Find...
15.	<p>More discussion of methodology/methods and less emphasis on the NARST proposal. The proposal is a wonderful goal but should not have been so pushed during the week.</p>	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM	 Find...
16.	<p>access to the university library online</p> <p>grad student-to-faculty ratio could be increased to 10 to 3 on a team if there is enough student demand, but not less than 7 to 3</p>	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM	 Find...
17.	<p>I think it was a fantastic experience. Other than question #9, I don't have any suggestions for improvement.</p>	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:41 PM	 Find...
18.	<p>It would've even been even better if I had more chance to talk with other group members about their research and concerns beyond my teammates.</p>	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:37 PM	 Find...
19.	<p>It would better if students can work with all the mentors. I did not have time and opportunity to talk with two of the mentors.</p>	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:34 PM	 Find...












11. In what ways did the SRI influence your research project?

	<i>answered question</i>	21
	<i>skipped question</i>	0
		Response Count
 Hide replies		21


25 responses per page

- | | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|---|
| 1. | The SRI really helped me think about how my research questions related to my theoretical framework and they were addressing what I really wanted to know something about. | Fri, Jul 24, 2009 2:19 PM |  Find... |
| 2. | The SRI had a profound influence on my project. I was able to refocus the study on one of my theoretical frameworks, refine my research questions, and reorganize my literature review. As I discussed my research interests with colleagues and mentors, I was also validated and affirmed by their feedback. This encouragement has strengthened my resolve to conduct and share my work. | Fri, Jul 24, 2009 1:11 PM |  Find... |
| 3. | SRI allowed me to place my research in the broader context of science teaching research currently being conducted. It allowed me to explore other theoretical frameworks that people in this field are using. | Wed, Jul 22, 2009 8:36 AM |  Find... |
| 4. | It helped solidify my framework for research | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 2:57 PM |  Find... |
| 5. | It focused the research, changed the research questions and helped me to clarify what I want to say in my research | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM |  Find... |
| 6. | I completed many parts of my study, but I got some important suggestions for discussion and implication parts. | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 3:31 AM |  Find... |
| 7. | The SRI helped me to rethink my theoretical framework and how to align my TF, research questions, data collection, and data analysis. | Mon, Jul 20, 2009 6:04 PM |  Find... |
| 8. | Changed my research focus and design. | Mon, Jul 20, 2009 2:19 PM |  Find... |
| 9. | It helped me refine my research | Sun, Jul |  Find... |


11. In what ways did the SRI influence your research project?

		19, 2009 10:22 PM	Find...
10.	It changed my theoretical framework views as I realized another framework that was more aligned to my research questions, methods, and analysis.	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 4:26 PM	 Find...
11.	It completely opened my eyes to my reserach question! I was able to focus my question and align it with my theoretical framework. For this reason alone, I am grateful for the SRI experience, although there are many more reasons than this!	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 2:35 PM	 Find...
12.	It helped me refine my research questions, which I had been having an extremely hard time doing. I was totally motivated and inspired to work on my research proposal for my dissertation when I returned home.	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 12:02 AM	 Find...
13.	The SRI helped me think about coherence and alignment. I can now look at my writing with a more trained, critical perspective.	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 3:09 PM	 Find...
14.	It motivated me to keep going!	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 1:51 PM	 Find...
15.	I got great ideas for my data collection and I made clarifications on my research questions.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 7:39 PM	 Find...
16.	Refined and aligned research questions with theoretical and conceptual frames!!!!	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM	 Find...
17.	I have a new direction for my dissert. proposal! I was in a quandary on my methodology for researching low-ses high school students, which made me rethink my research questions, and made the whole project a mess. Faculty suggested a new technique for data collection and, with the discussions of qualitative research, made me want to take a 100% qualitative approach as opposed to mixed or quant. Since that week, I've re-read my methods books and I see everything in a new light. I am much happier, more confident, and more interested in what I will find during my research!	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM	 Find...
	My original project that I submitted with my application was also unclear. It is an activity system analysis and I wasn't sure how the theory and my data would fit. Again, after suggestions and faculty presentations, it became much more clear and I now have a simple, clear concept of the study which I am eager to bring back to my adviser (she's been on vacation).		
18.	Helped me refine my research questions and align research questions with data sources. Helped me try to keep it simple. I received so much great feedback--more than I've gotten all year with my own adviser.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:41 PM	 Find...
19.	It really helped me to understand what roles of each section plays including theoretical framework, research questions, data collection, etc. The questions that I got from peers and mentors made me rethink and reevaluate my research.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:37 PM	 Find...
20.	I have learned how to design and conduct better educational research studies	Mon, Jul	










11. In what ways did the SRI influence your research project?











		13, 2009 3:34 PM	Find...
21.	It helped me align my work more neatly with my theoretical framework. It also helped me to figure out how to clarify my work for others who are not as deeply involved in my project as I am.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:25 PM	 Find...

12. In what ways did the SRI influence you as a researcher?

	answered question	21
	skipped question	0
		Response Count
	 Hide replies	21

25 responses per page

- | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------|---|
| 1. | The SRI solidified in me the need to collaborate on projects and to get other researchers feedback on my own research. The network of collaboration that was established at the SRI I'm sure will prove to be invaluable. | Fri, Jul 24, 2009 2:19 PM |  Find... |
| 2. | The SRI built my confidence as a science education researcher. Having the opportunity to see that other students (and mentors) experience many of the same challenges and are motivated by the same passions that I do allowed me to see, more clearly, the paths that I can take and the contributions I can make to the field. | Fri, Jul 24, 2009 1:11 PM |  Find... |
| 3. | I feel less isolated, more connected to the conversation that is going on around science teaching research and this is profoundly helpful. | Wed, Jul 22, 2009 8:36 AM |  Find... |
| 4. | It provided me opportunities to work as a researcher and it built my confidence as a member of the research community. | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 2:57 PM |  Find... |
| 5. | It gave me a lot of motivation to keep on doing and writing and also gave the confidence as a researcher | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 4:19 AM |  Find... |
| 6. | During the SRI I had a chance to observe how to work, help, collaborate professional science educators, and I understand the importance of being a member of science education community. Also, I met my future colleagues. | Tue, Jul 21, 2009 3:31 AM |  Find... |
| 7. | The SRI have influenced me as a researcher by establishing a network of individuals to conduct research with. The SRI also helped me to establish a research agenda and a research plan. | Mon, Jul 20, 2009 6:04 PM |  Find... |
| 8. | To develop a community of peers for which I can receive and provide feedback. | Mon, Jul 20, 2009 2:19 PM |  Find... |
| 9. | It has started me on the path to becoming an education researcher. I can only hope to be half as good as my mentors and make a difference in the way science is taught to | Sun, Jul 19, 2009 |  Find... |

12. In what ways did the SRI influence you as a researcher?		
	students.	10:22 PM
10.	Listening to the faculty share their knowledge and experiences was inspiring. Also, coming from a campus with few science edu doctoral students, the SRI provided a great opportunity to meet such a huge crowd of prospective researchers who shared their research and talked about long term plans.	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 4:26 PM  Find...
11.	I didn't think I wanted to be a researcher before this, but after this experience, I am rethinking this thought. It has energized and revitalized my interest in research. I realized the contributions I may make in the field if I do choose to conduct and publish research, and this inspires me to go into research after graduation!	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 2:35 PM  Find...
12.	I feel more confident in my ideas, in my abilities to complete my degree, and that some of my ideas are important to the field. I also feel fortunate to be in the same field as the many researchers and graduate students I met	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 12:02 AM  Find...
13.	I was inspired by the dedication of the mentors, They welcomed me into the community of science educators. I have created a stronger network of fellow graduate student and I have already spent a day writing with one of my team members :-).	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 3:09 PM  Find...
14.	I now consider myself a researcher. Before I felt like "just a student."	Tue, Jul 14, 2009 1:51 PM  Find...
15.	After SRI, I felt more like a part of a community of science teacher education research. And, by listening faculty members, I understood the importance of participating NARST annual conferences, making publications as much as we can.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 7:39 PM  Find...
16.	Allowed me to be gentler with myself.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 6:43 PM  Find...
17.	I have opened up to qualitative methods. The institute made me aware of how qual methods could fit my research interests and made me want to investigate more. As a result, I've can't stop thinking about my research. I've been constantly reading articles on method (phenomenography, ethnography, case studies) and examples of studies that use these methods, the types of questions that they answer, and imagining the possibilities for my proposal. Without SRI, I'm not sure when I would've changed my views!	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:48 PM  Find...
18.	I feel like I left with so much more momentum than I've ever had in my doctoral program. Before I came to the SRI, I was really questioning whether or not I "fit in" as a researcher. Now I feel that there is a community out there of people who understand my work, think it's valuable, and will support me as I continue to work in the field of science education.	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:41 PM  Find...
19.	Whenever I attended in the NARST conference, I've felt that I was out of this 'circle', not as a member of this community. Now I feel I can be a member of this community though still it is peripheral. That means a lot to me and I feel I can ask questions to presentors in NARST session. I was so impressed with all mentor teachers and their dedication that they showed to us during this SRI. I've known their names quite well through their publication, but not so much about as persons who are ahead of me in the similar road and may have similar	Mon, Jul 13, 2009 3:37 PM  Find...

12. In what ways did the SRI influence you as a researcher?

experiences, frustrations, and interests. It was so great to know them as a person and hear their stories as a researcher, stories of how they have been building their careers, and even see how they start their day and make a balance between their life and research. I changed my life style after I came back from SRI. I set some routines such as morning exercise and writing time in the morning. I changed my habit to check my email.

Most of all, I am seriously thinking about my responsibilities as a researcher in education. This SRI taught me the power of community, and some day I would like to contribute for the communities that I will involve in or in formulating those communities with my initiate.

20. I have learned that I am just at the beginning of the road; but I think I found role models-my mentors!

Mon, Jul
13, 2009
3:34 PM



21. I think I have changed the way I view myself and my contributions to the science education community. I am much more enthusiastic about research and more confident in my ability to make a real contribution.

Mon, Jul
13, 2009
3:25 PM

